Minimal Support for Garbage Collection and Reachability-Based Leak Detection

WG21/N2585 = J16/08-0095

2008-03-16

Hans Boehm Mike Spertus

Goal

- Support
 - Conservative Garbage Collection
 - Reachability-based leak detection
 - Which becomes more critical with qui ck_exi t()
- By
 - Giving undefined behavior to programs that hide pointers.
 - Providing a small API to "unhide" pointers.
 - Providing a small API to make collection less conservative.

Charter

• Kona motion 1:

WG21 Resolves that for this revision of the C++ standard (aka "C++0x") the scope of the memory management extensions shall be constrained as follows:

- Include making some uses of disguised pointers undefined, and providing a small set of functions to exempt specific objects from this restriction and to designate pointer-free regions of memory (where these functions would have trivial implementations in a non-collected conforming implementation).
- Exclude explicit syntax or functions for garbage collection or related features such as finalization.

Hiding pointers

• The real issue is dereferencing previously disguised pointers:

T *p = new ...; intptr_t x = (intptr_t)(p) ^ 0x555; a: T *q = (T *)(x ^ 0x555); T y = *q;

- *p is reachable everywhere.
- But if collection occurs at a, *p may be reclaimed, since p is dead.

Hidden pointers

- Proposed wording classifies pointers as
 - Reconstituted, or
 - Safely derived
- This is a property of how the pointer is computed, not the bit representation of the pointer.
 - In the preceding example:
 - p is safely derived.
 - q is reconstituted
 - they are likely to be bitwise identical

New constraint

- Reconstituted pointers may not be dereferenced.
- More precisely:

A pointer to storage obtained from an allocation function shall be dereferenced or passed to a deallocation function only if it was either safely derived, or the referenced object was previously *declared reachable* (see [library:declare_reachable])

This does not:

- Preserve correctness of all current C++ programs.
 - We really can't if we want to move usefully closer to GC support.
 - Code that encodes pointers either has to break or leak.
- Require GC support in the implementation.
 - Vendors can trivially provide implementations that conform to the standard and don't break old code.

Issues

- Where can we store pointers without making them "reconstituted"?
 - Currently in T*, i ntptr_t, and sufficiently aligned sections of char arrays.
- Might it be OK to dereference a reconstituted pointer if a safely derived pointer is stored in a non-stack location?
 - Eliminates need for part of API, but has optimization consequences for GC-based implementations.
 - We're leaning against.

Issues contd.

- Do the rules apply to malloc'ed memory, as opposed to just memory allocated with default operator new (and the default STL allocator)?
 - Pro: More useful.
 - Con: Low-level OS code sometimes hides pointers. Would need fixing for GC implementation.
 - Con: Arguably infringes on WG14 territory.
 - Currently: No.

"Unhiding" API

- void declare_reachable(void* p)
 throw(std::bad_alloc)
 - p is a safely derived pointer.
 - Allows reconstituted copies of p to be dereferenced.
- templ ate < typename T > T*
 undecl are_reachable(T* p) throw()
 - Undoes declare_reachable.
 - Returns safely derived pointer.

Intended usage

- Calls bracket code that hides pointers.
- E.g. decl are_reachable() before inserting node into xor-list, undecl are_reachable() on removal.
- Note that we need a safely derived pointer to the node after removal.
- Implementation:
 - Insert into global/thread-local multiset.

Issues

- voi d * vs. template: inconsistency is ugly.
- Should undeclare_reachable return safely derived pointer, or make argument safely derived?
- We allow non-heap pointers, disallow null. Is this right?

Pointer-location API

- void declare_no_pointers(char* p, size_t n) throw()
- Declares [p, p+n) to contain no pointers. (Pointers stored there become reconstituted.)
 voi d undecl are_no_pointers(char* p, si ze_t n) throw()
 - Undoes the effect of the above call.
 Arguments must match exactly. Calls on the same arguments don't nest.

Declare_no_pointers() purpose

- Prevent the collector from needlessly tracing data known to not contain pointers.
 - Can significantly reduce extra memory retention by conservative collector
 - Especially in dense address spaces.
 - Can sometimes substantially reduce tracing time.

Implementation: A bit tricky, but we believe we can get it to a dozen or so memory operations for small regions.

Issues

- Combined decl are_no_poi nters() + operator new call?
 - More efficiently implementable.
 - Supported by existing collectors.
 - Con: Widens API.
- What's the lifetime of a decl are_no_poi nters() call?

- Currently until inverse call or object collection.